

They have not been called upon to pass upon the bearing the lesions found might have upon the state of the subject's mind, and, therefore, do not offer an opinion.

Respectfully submitted,

J. W. S. ARNOLD,
E. O. SHAKESPEARE,
J. C. MCCONNELL.

September 4, 1882.

Dr. Lamb furnishes the following measurements of Guiteau's skull :

Cranium of a male, age nearly 41.

Internal capacity	1530 cc.
Length	182 mm.
Breadth	144 "
Breadth of frontal	97 and 125 "
Height	133 "
Index of foramen magnum	45 "
Frontal arch	290 "
Parietal arch	323 "
Occipital arch	243 "
Longitudinal arch	380 "
Circumference	521 "
Length of frontal bone	127 "
Length of parietal bone	135 "
Length of occipital bone	183 "
Zygomatic diameter	125 "
Facial angle	71°
Skull, mesocephalic.	

A FORCED DEDUCTION.

SUMMING up the lesions discovered by the microscopical examination of portions of Guiteau's brain, the *Medical News* (Sept. 9, 1882) says : " They (the lesions) constitute the initial stage of a malady which, in its fullest development, is known as dementia paralytica or an allied disease, the early symptoms of which disorder correspond closely with the mental condition of Guiteau during the past year."

Guiteau was, then, insane, if there is any meaning in language. But the sapient *News* does not think so, and proceeds to eat its own words. Driven to the wall by the stern evidence of the facts, it proceeds to wriggle in this wise : " Mere structural changes of the organic substratum cannot be safely interpreted alone." But the *News* has already interpreted these changes to mean dementia paralytica—a well-recognized form of insanity ;—hence, this eva-

sion is transparent. Even the *News* sees this, for it proceeds, like the squid, to conceal its discomfiture in more confusion by adding: "The clinical history must be studied in connection with the alterations in the cerebral structures." No discussion is needed here for pursuing "this logical course." The *News* hastens on to its own destruction and finds that it "can be conducted to but one conclusion, viz.: "that *although Guiteau was not strictly normal in respect to the condition of the organic substratum of the mind, and in respect to its symptomatic expression* (italics ours), he was, nevertheless, a responsible agent, in that he had *a clear perception of the distinction between right and wrong*, and realized the nature of the crime and its punishment."

Here, then, is the position of the argument: Guiteau's brain was diseased. It is demonstrated and admitted that he had dementia paralytica. As regards his mind, he was abnormal "in respect to its symptomatic expression." What then remains to demonstrate his sanity according to the *News*? Simply the assertion "that he had a clear conception of the distinction between right and wrong." Well, did he? To assert it simply begs the entire question; nay, more, contradicts the very arguments that the *News* has brought up to sustain its position. Do men with the clearly demonstrated anatomical lesions of a well-recognized form of insanity, and with minds abnormal in respect to symptomatic expression, know the difference between right and wrong? If they do, let the asylums of the land be emptied of their patients subject to paralytic dementia, and let them be held amenable to the law.

We confess to a feeling of regret at seeing our able contemporary sacrificing both pathological findings and clinical history to an unproven assertion based on the metaphysical relations between right and wrong.

And there is another feeling to which we are not altogether strangers: it is that of compassion for a distinguished alienist, of whom his country may well be proud; who, heedless of his reputation for caution and fair-play and scientific acumen, has rushed into print to defend his friends of the "asylum ring" on

this side of the water. If Dr. Bucknill were a Japanese of the olden time he could scarcely refrain from committing *hari-kari* physically, as he has already perpetrated it psychically. Probably no more humiliating spectacle has been recently witnessed than that of a gentleman of Dr. Bucknill's scientific position un saying, in a recent number of *Brain*, his wise words of not very long ago. We await with interest his further lucubrations on the subject of reasoning mania in general and Guiteau's sanity in particular.

DR. L. C. GRAY ON HYPNOTISM AND OTHER SUBJECTS.

MEDICINE has not, so far as we are aware, heretofore been deemed a pursuit specially adapted for the display of humor ; but in this era of progress, one must be prepared for any thing ; and, accordingly, our readers will perhaps not be surprised to hear of the singular proficiency in that respect of Dr. L. C. Gray of Brooklyn. This gentleman has recently been entertaining the Medical Society of the County of Kings with a disquisition on hypnotism, illustrated by experiments on animals. Now, if there be any thing comical in the phenomena of hypnotism, it might be supposed that, in the large amount of attention which has latterly been given thereto, the comicality would have become somewhat threadbare. Dr. Gray, however, is not a man to be easily discouraged. Casting about in his mind for some means of tickling his auditors' midribs, he hit upon the capital device of representing himself as being the only true and original hypnotic experimenter on animals—none others being genuine except "Mr. Egner, the bird-fancier." We can imagine the Homeric mirth which this announcement must have created. Here were Dr. Gray and Mr. Egner, the bird-fancier, on the one side ; and, on the other, Dr. Czermak of Berlin, Dr. Hammond of New York (the first to produce hypnotic phenomena in animals), an indefinite number of so-called mesmerisers who had frequently performed the same feat, and a large body of hypnotic literature,—each and all whereof were in the ludicrous position of being ignored by this delightful humorist ; indeed, if we may judge from the report of his lecture, he had never heard even of any